I hate taking a 6 compot fighter squadron off the line and replacing it with a 12 compot PF group.

DUDE!!!! Are you FREAKING KIDDING ME?!?!?!?

The Hydrans can use PF better than ANYONE ELSE. They bring all these fighters that they can burn your damage on, so they don't HAVE to kill the PFs. They pretty much DO NOT have to play the Cocaine game if they don't want to.

4 IP SCS
3 OV BCS
1 NSC (who provides fighters no less)
3 HR + 3 DWF Battle Group

or

4 IP SCS
3 OV BCS
1 NSC
3 RNX
1 RN (formation)
1 HR

I'm not sure if the Hyrans can manage a X-BG, but whatever...

Lets see....I can't even do the math in my head there because I'm not sure what the NEC + DWE look like off the top of my head.. but I'm betting there are nearly 40 fighters in both groups, and really the only thing for you to direct at is a HR or a RNX. (Bummer about the poor RNX, but you've gotta expose it to use it) In most cases, the Hydrans will be assaulting a Coalition hard point so you would yank something and put a SAF in there. You could always put another IP up in the line for your 3rd carrier group if you are fighting an open space battle where the Coalition is looking to bang something and go. The coalition is going to feel mighty silly facing 130 point fleets in the Hydran theater and "mauling" a DWE to death. Congrats, I just dropped 40 points of damage on you. I'm not even going to BOTHER to DD your mauler, just eat death and like it, I'll take all the leftover damage on fighters and preserve my PF cocaine rush for your SBs.... the places it really matters.

I'm going to put 2-3 pegasus behind each of those lines, just like I'm going to have 2 FCR or so just so you CAN'T try to DD the PFs out and lower my compot. I'm not planning on using them, I've just got them so that if you WANT to let my
RNX live, I won't drop any density.

THIS IS WHY YOU DON'T LOSE THE HYDRAN FLEET EARLY... THERE IS NOTHING MORE DANGEROUS IN F&E THAN A PISSED OF HYDRAN WITH ENOUGH "TOYS" TO BUILD OPTIMAL LINES. The Fed 3rd way is great.... its almost as good as a Hydran battle line.

You can call it Hydran Invinciblity Syndrome if you want, but really.... Nothing can stand against a Hydran with all his toys. (The problem is most people lose the fleet and never see how deadly the Hydrans are once they get all the CW/DW toys to play with)

By Joe Stevenson (Ikv_Sabre) On Friday, November 21, 2008 - 11:21 am: Edit

Amen, Larry

By Edward Kroeten (Ekroeten) On Friday, November 21, 2008 - 02:38 pm: Edit

Trent,

Ok, I went back and looked over my notes from the late war turns I have 5 games that went that long. In 3 of them the Lyran fleet was still bigger than the Kzinti fleet by a significant margin in the 4th they had parity. So only in one game did the Zin have a larger fleet than the Lyrans and it was still close.

On the Fed front the Klingons take a beating but give ground slowly. They usually lose a lot of territory but not the Capital.

Hydran front is a split decision either they have just taken back there Cap and working to take Klingon border provinces or they have hooked up with the Fed and are attacking the Klingon Capital on the last one or two turns.

In the one game that the Zin had superiorty was because the Roms were completely out of the war. The Hydrans had come back in a big time (Almost Joe's green menace). And the Gorns were still in the war.

This I think is an unusual case as the Roms can at least put the Gorns out of the game until the late T20s if not into the 30s before they can go off to send ships to the west.

So again I just don't see how in a normal game the Zin will have more SE than the Lyrans in the mid 20 game turns. I looked at the Zin fleet around T15 it is usually still under 100 ships. T16 they start to suffer exhaustion and can't build their full build schedule the Lyrans can all the way through PF deployment. And when the old ships are scrapped to the dead pile that is how the Lyrans pay for the PFs. They don't generally have to strip the bases of PFs until the last few turns.
I do agree use the PFs yes it increases the COMPOUT but I don't see the Zin wiping out the Lyrans it just doesn't happen in the full campaign unless the Coalition steps on their own sword.

I agree with Larry the Hydrans are nasty but you have to bottle them up off map for as long as possible. Once they have the econ to build a lot of ships you are in trouble. Thankfully their econ is small and usually are not back in the war with a full ship yard until one or two turns from exhaustion (75%).

Now as I have said before all of this becomes moot if the coalition wins by T20 that should be every commanders goal.

Ed,

The Kzinti position versus the Lyrans boils down to holding the planet 1202.

The Feds will assist with 1802 for logistical reasons and no Lyran can hold 1502 without massive Klingon assistance the Feds will draw away.

The spread sheet PFs and the Kzinti Aux-ship seige train will get the Kzinti 1202 and take down any Coalition hard point sitting there.

Remember that between 18 base PFs and three Aux-PFT the Kzinti are getting 2.1 "PF Swarms" to add on top of their huge CV fighter numbers.

And if you try and pin me out of 1202 by reacting to 1302, like happened in General War 2006. The Kzinti player has the option of launching offensive fighter strikes from his bases and monitors in 1401 to add to the attrition unit and ship equivalent count in 1302 for both further movement and combat.

Kzinti posession of planet 1202 opens up minor planets 1001, 1105, 1407, 1504, and 1506, plus BATS 0705, 0906, 1107, 1307, 1507 for a six hex supply range attack fleet.

A seven hex range from 1202 opens up BATS 0502, 0504, and 1707 to x-ship attack and raids.

The off map area and 1202 will get the Kzinti 1001 because the Lyran fleet cannot hold 1001 and defend every other target 1202 enables the Kzinti to hit because in the late war the Lyrans lack the early war margins of ship superiority to pin them out of every possible target.

Then the Kzinti will play a game of hitting you where you ain't until there isn't a BATS left on the Kzinti border and they have their territory cleared of Coalition forces.
And if you try and pin me out of 1202 by reacting to 1302, like happened in General War 2006. The Kzinti player has the option of launching offensive fighter strikes from his bases and monitors in 1401 to add to the attrition unit and ship equivalent count in 1302 for both further movement and combat.

First what bases at 1401 are you kidding me? And next monitors cannot do offensive fighter strikes. So then, No that doesn't work.

The spread sheet PFs and the Kzinti Aux-ship siege train will get the Kzinti 1202 and take down any Coalition hard point sitting there.

Remember that between 18 base PFs and three Aux-PFT the Kzinti are getting 2.1 "PF Swarms" to add on top of their huge CV fighter numbers.

Yes you have carriers, but you had the carriers before the PFs and were outnumbered. By the time you add the PFs in force it is T27 and you don't get X-ships until T28. Even then the Lyrans outnumbered the Zin.

The Kzinti position versus the Lyrans boils down to holding the planet 1202.

The Feds will assist with 1802 for logistical reasons and no Lyran can hold 1502 without massive Klingon assistance the Feds will draw away.

That is the whole point the Co is on the defensive now they will defend one spot not 10. You will have to outnumber them to come in which the Zin alone don't (They can with Fed help, but that goes to my whole point the Feds win or lose the war not the Zin). The coalition will have fall back locations that you can swing around and pop but that will take time that you don't have.

You are right about the off map area you can cover the whole of Zin space, but to win you have to fight it out with the Lyran fleet. And as I said before if 1202 is my spot there will be 2SBs there(I will build the second early in the war T18 or so if I think I am not going to win right away) and you will have a really tough nut to crack.

Hi.

Now that Altered Alliances: Four Powers War has been published, I was wondering what some of you guys might make of it, in terms of taking part in the scenario?
(Is there a particular side, or empire, you'd want to try out, how would you make use of them, and so forth.)

That is, if any of you like the idea of trying the scenario in the first place...

What is it?

It's a variant of the Four Powers War scenario, but one which pits a Klingon-Kzinti Coalition against the Lyran-Hydran Alliance.

It has a number of changes and edits intended by its lowly original author to maintain a degree of balance - but I'd wager that Chuck's efforts in turning it into something fit for publication do much to make it so, rather than anything I had gotten it to before he had a look at it...

Gary,

I don't play the small scenarios often, but if I do, I'd certainly give it consideration.

Joe!

Small scenarios are very groovy if you can get past odd OBs and hockey start-up conditions... like late war Rom fleets with only two heavy carriers.

Small scenarios are the only way I get to play consistently face-to-face.

I have often thought that Klingon-Kzinti vs Lyran-Hydran would be fun, because from an empire size perspective it is probably more balanced. So was this published in the latest CL?

"Small scenarios are very groovy"

No disagreement, there. I just tend to play the GW.

I've actually had an idea for a similar small scenario, with the Kzinti and Lyrans vs. an expanded Klingons; the idea is that the Lyrans and Klingons won the 4PW and conquered the Hydrans, then the more powerful Klingons shafted the Lyrans out of their part of the spoils. This act caused the Lyrans to consider the
unconsiderable… to make a deal with the Kzinti to take revenge on the Klingon.

By Kosta Michalopoulos (Kosmic) on Tuesday, December 02, 2008 - 01:56 pm: Edit
Gary, I’ve been itching to get a F2F F&E game going again. And I'm in Toronto.

But time (or lack thereof) has always been my nemesis.

By Gary Carney (Nerroth) on Tuesday, December 02, 2008 - 03:47 pm: Edit
AA:4PW is indeed in CL38 - though I'm just trying to clarify a few points here and there over in the AAR thread.

And unfortunately, I was limited in terms of what I could pack from Ireland this time around, and I had to leave most of my Fed and Empire stuff back there… sigh.

(I have the books themselves - though my main rulebook seems to be hiding away somewhere - but the maps and counters and stuff are back there.)

By Chuck Strong (Raider) on Friday, December 12, 2008 - 02:11 am: Edit
Jean: This topic can be rolled into a 2007-2008 archive on or after 31 Dec 2008 -- archives above.

By Trent Telenko (Ttelenko) on Thursday, December 18, 2008 - 05:52 pm: Edit
Ed K.,

This is an old 2004 report of the AO sector B playtests that I originally posted on the FO scenario revision topic in the F&E proposals section of the BBS.

=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*=*

The Kzinti in AO Sector B have interior lines of communications versus the Coalition and far fewer positions to defend. This isn't like the opening part of the game where the Kzinti are massively outnumbered and only SBs can be defended in strength. Between the Kzinti ship and fighter factor ship equivalent count, they are outnumbered something between 5 to 4 and 4 to three at the start of the scenario.

As the Coalition, you don't want to go anywhere near the Kzinti home worlds. Four brigades PDUs, one X-SB, one non-X SB and a BATS all augmented by either Heavy fighters or PF sit there over the Capitol planet. A two full battles line plus auxillaries can hold it against anything a Coalition player can sneak through a competent Kzinti who made a mistake.

Each of the Kzinti BATS/MB/minor/major is in reaction range of another. The Coalition moved first, but a competent Kzinti will have a battle line on each plus two unpinnable full CVA plus ADM reserves. If the Coalition's opening move is to hit one place, other than the capitol, in overwhelming numbers. They can take it,
but the Kzinti will have an ADM plus 96 or more fighter factors waiting. They will sit and use them up before they are driven off.

If the Coalition spreads out attacks to try and bag BATS or minor planets, the Kzinti will have two full battle lines and a minimum of 48 fighters to great the attackers. They may hold the position or not afterwards, but they will take less economic damage to their ships that they can repair faster and cheaper via CEDS than normal ship hulls.

Sure, you as the Coalition will inflict more total damage, but the Kzinti fighter pool comes back free and replacement PFs don't. Worse, with the Kzinti Capitol within seven hexes of 90% of the Coalition targets and unassailable, the Kzinti can retrograde all their damaged CVs and escorts to 24(SBX)+16(SB)+12(FRD)+12(FRD)+4(BATS) repair points at 1401 while the Coalition's repair facilities are spread out to heck and gone.

Using all the repair capability at once will cost the Kzinti new ship production, but not that much after the X-economy arrives.

What happened repeatedly is that Kzinti carrier fleets were hitting where the Coalition wasn't able to pin them out, with 72 to 96 fighters, and the Coalition generally lose 2-3 BATS or minor plants a turn.

The Coalition also had three separate SB and a Lyran BATS plus PDU brigade plus Monitor with SCS pallet over 1001 it has to cover that are not in mutual supporting distance. If the Coalition concentrates for an offensive, one of them becomes uncovered enough for the Kzinti to take out.

Heck, due to being right next to the off-map area and within three hexes of another Kzinti minor, there is no way to keep a strong Kzinti carrier fleet and siege train out of 1001 on turn one.

Usually by turn four of the scenario, the Lyrans are glutted with cripples (CW and DW) without the means to repair them unless they send them to the home world. That is when the Kzinti go for broke repairing cripples and building X-ships to take out one of those three star bases.

In each of the two AO sector B play tests I got lucky to hit an undefended Lyran SB on turns 2-3 and on turn four I hit and took out a Lyran defended SB. Come the last turn of the AO Sector B scenario I was conducting a by the numbers siege train assault on the Klingon SB. I walked into those set piece assault battles with 150 plus fighters and six to seven PF flotillas.

This, mind you, was in a play test without the heavy fighters of the published scenario. The Kzinti heavy fighter deployment rules not having been available for play test.
So yes, I think the Kzinti in the Sector B AO set up are doing just fine and the Coalition needs some real help in the attrition unit department.

Survey Question on Survey:

Has anyone run the math to see when it stops being worthwhile to have a survey ship doing survey duty in the off map areas, and to bring them on map to get that 1 ep per turn?

Ted, going off the games I’ve played in the past, once it takes you consistently 4 to 5 turns to get a province with 3 survey cruisers.

The number of survey cruisers you add to survey duty will change that. As a general rule, the Feds will gain a province a turn from turns 7 to 17 then another 5 to 7 over the next 10 turns, assuming no change is made to their numbers. Also economic exhaustion will come into play for that decision. Using the Feds above, no, I wouldn't bring them on map.

It might actually be more worthwhile to have one of the survey cruisers start using the high risk survey rather than bring the survey ship on map. I would consider that at the point in which economic exhaustion starts to kick in.

The Klingons seem to be the only race who would benefit immediately from bringing a survey cruise on to the map, or better yet, leaving their 2 off map and building a third one for on map survey.

Thomas,

That makes sense. At the moment, I'm maxing out (or will shortly) survey in a game. So, I'll have 6 SRs for the Lyrans and 5 SRs for the Klingons. At a cost of 13 EP, it just doesn't seem worthwhile to make another one just for on-map survey (+14 turns before it starts to make $$). However, it would make sense to bring them all onto the map once the survey zones start topping out.

But, if the general rule of thumb is 4-5 turns for a province, that's something I can work with. I realize you said that was for 3 survey cruisers, but I think the same principle will apply once you are at 3+ survey cruisers.

Off map survey has the benefit of being cumulative (you keep adding to your income). On map has the benefit of getting points now, but is not cumulative adding to your overall income level over time. At some point, mathematically, there's a threshold when the two meet. At that point you want to bring the survey ships on-map.
Although 4-5 turns per province might be a rule of thumb, maybe mathematically you benefit more if you bring that number down to 3-4 (or, for that matter, even raise it).

Anyone done quantitative analysis on this issue?

Ted

At one point I made spreadsheets for every single empire for the worth of offmap survey with +1, +2, +3 SR and with the feature of overproducing a specialty ship (I don't have my books in front of me right now so I can't remember the term). I list out the survey points and the provinces rate (all done assuming 3.5 survey points per SR). I think you could modify that spreadsheet to get the answer you are looking for. Ah ha! This topic is slow enough they still exist as posted! Check out the Klingons which is in this thread under January 24th, 2007. If you would like the spreadsheet, e-mail me at the address listed in my profile and I'd be happy to e-mail them to you (written before I go back to my house and look for the files on my computer). The other empires are listed earlier in the thread under the 2005-2006 archive.

Just to be clear(er), I know you would like to figure out the point of diminishing returns, but I think you would be able to pull that from the data I put up.

A question in the same vein: has anyone done an analysis on the optimal placement of colonies on the map?

Email sent. I had seen your analysis, and done one of my own, but it occurred to me a more difficult (and more useful) question is when - given only a 34 turn game - is it better to just get 5 per turn rather than increasing the net economy?

Dale, email sent. Thanks in advance.

Ted, I don't know about 5 per turn, and there is a limit (534.24) of turns between attempts for a given hex. Also there are some other modifiers including economic exhaustion to keep in mind. So if your economy is at 75% 4 SR's will get you 3 EPs pending other factors. Enough to build a frigate or repair a DN, but it is quicker than trying to add another province to your economy.

Ted, one thing we both missed, and I thought of while I was at work today, was the inclusion of a PT on Survey Duty. That will give you an additional 2-3 provinces over the course of a game.
The PT will certainly change the calculus of any such analysis.

I think, although I am not 100% sure, that if you use a PT you may have to make a 'safety' roll for the surveying PT. If this is the case then a few bad rolls and it could be detrimental to the whole operation. Not to mention an injured PT has to find a HSP ship or go back to the Cap to get well.

Prime Teams on survey are wounded on 2d6 roll of 11 and killed on a 12.

The risk to a PT is no better or worse than using a SR under the high risk survey rules where it's crippled on a 1 of 1d6.

Your 10.5 average for 3 SR's becomes a 12.5. Even accepting that over the course of 30 turns you roll 3 11's or 12's you still gain that's 54 survey points resulting in approximately 1.7 new provinces just for the survey team.

Note the math is not exact as I'm not using a spreadsheet or calculator to calculate the exact values.

The Lyrans and probably the Gorns can best benefit from increasing their number of survey ships to the maximum. One because they seem to have some money to burn for it, and two, the ability to pay the high cost of production of a SR without losing too much other production.

Okay, I looked up the survey rules (542.3) (SO pg. 12) and generally you do this:

Turn 1) Stop surveying. Ship moves to OffMap.
Turn 2) Ship moves by operational movement somewhere without a base
Turn 3) SR gets 1 EP and can move somewhere else.
Turn N) Rinse, Wash, Repeat.

Klingons have:

Turn 1) SR stops surveying and moves to OffMap.
Turn 2) SR strategically moves to Klingon territory.
Turn 3) SR moves by operational movement somewhere without a base
Turn 4) SR gets 1 EP and can move somewhere else.
Turn N) Rinse, Wash, Repeat.
My intuition says it won't be economically feasible for the Klingons due to their low numbers of surveyed provinces, but I would have to check the details. Maybe after the talk with my folks.

By Bill Schoeller (Bigbadbill) On Sunday, April 26, 2009 - 11:42 pm: Edit

Can the Klingon not send its survey ships off map on turn 1 since it has control of its economy? The Klingon ships don't start in the Lyran off map, and move there on turn 2 Coalition in a normal game.

By Dale Lloyd Fields (Dylkha) On Monday, April 27, 2009 - 12:21 am: Edit

Bill

Ah, I see the problem. The D7E and D6E do technically start at the capital on T1 and move by special, pre-paid strategic movement on that turn and do start surveying on T2. When I listed T1, T2, I was referring to when you decide to stop using them in their standard surveying duty. Use something like T28 (stop surveying), T29 (strat back to Klingon territory), T30 (OpMove to an empty hex), T31 (receive 1 EP and move somewhere else). My apologies to whomever I confused with that labeling.

[Edit: Whoops. OnMap surveying is subject to exhaustion, and looking at (542.34) it seems to indicate that the Klingons can survey Lyran provinces and still get the EP as long as they are within supply of their own grid. So the Klingons could survey their way across Lyran territory until they return to Klingon space and ignore that extra turn.]

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) On Monday, April 27, 2009 - 07:48 am: Edit

So, I read in Starquake 2 that the Fed is likely to be activated on A5. Has anyone played a game in which the Coalition recovered from such an Alliance coup? In my limited experience, it seems like a game-winning victory with all those extra ships and all the extra econ the Feds get; however, I wanted to get other people's impressions.

By Bill Stec (Billstec2) On Monday, April 27, 2009 - 08:09 am: Edit

Ted,

We ran across this in a 10-turn delayed GW game, where the Hydrans conducted a successful expedition on T4A (I think).

We had the Feds go active and attack the Klingons on T5A. That might have been a mistake, as the number of ships the Klingons got from the IWR was kind of sick; initially the Klingons pushed the Feds back hard from their initial attack.

It wasn't until T7-ish that the higher FED economy made itself felt and the Feds started to push back pretty hard. That coupled with both the Kzin and Hydran capitals not having fallen made the Coalition player decide there was little point in
continuing.

In retrospect, I think it might have been better to have the Feds help the Kzin in Kzin space, and not attack the Klingons for 1-2 turns - allowing a larger buildup before poking the Klingon bear. I recall saying to the fed player - man, we sure did stir up the Hornet's nest by attacking so soon, didn't we?

Ted, it can be done. Most people give up assuming their opponent is not going to also make mistakes and the game ends. OTOH I have seen players discuss it and they decide to allow to let the Romulans come into the game early in response to the earlier Fed entry. This can be done conditionally or not.

The Roms are not quite ready on say turn 8 (also 2 turns earlier than normal for this example) but the overall situation is shifted to a more balanced one. The Gorn then, would also enter early but again they are a few ships short of their PWC load so it is a wash. It can make for a fun game despite the early issues, and avoids the typical throw both hands up and start over reaction. It also allows players to move past the T5-10 impass that stopps most games and get the players experience in the mid- and eventually the late-war fun techs.

The players could decide to move other stuff up as well possibly increasing PF entry dates...etc.

Giving up is the natural reaction. It's a heavy blow to the Coalition.

In fact, the possibility of the Expedition is one of the reasons why I nearly always prosecute a Hydran first strategy. About the only way I can guarantee the expedition will fail is to put something like 125+ SE at 1013 to stop a North Expedition (via Kzinti space) and position Home and East to stop an East Expedition (via Klingon Space). But, if you do that, then you're pretty much positioned already for Hydran first.
Ted, it can be done. Most people give up assuming their opponent is not going to also make mistakes and the game ends. OTOH I have seen players discuss it and they decide to allow to let the Romulans come into the game early in response to the earlier Fed entry. This can be done conditionally or not.

Of course, you could "fudge" by giving the Coalition a break. However, that's not "satisfying" from my point of view. I'm not saying that fudging doesn't work for others, but it's not my cup of tea.

I guess, I'm wondering what has happened to anyone who actually played until mid-late general war where the expedition succeeded?

However, I'm guessing such games are rare (if they exist at all). Most of the time, if the expedition succeeds the Coalition throws in the towel and a new game is started (particularly because the game is still "young.")

Look at the game between Tim Losberg and Sean Dzafovic. They are now on T19 in a game where the Aliance got the Expedition through. Neither side has given up and though the Alliance was 'ahead' for quite a while. The Coalition have had a couple of very good maneuvering rounds and have, if not gained the lead, have made life pure hell for the Alliance.

It's a fun game to watch and keep updated on.

Just because something doesn't go right, it's just suckie for the Coalition player to surrender. I mean in every game they rampage across the galaxy, why not let your Alliance player have some fun for once instead of always being the reactor. Getting the Expedition across is painful yes, but, doesn't have to mean game over immediately.

Jimi

Jimi, thanks. Which thread is that Losberg/Dzafovic game? I might read the whole thing as an education excercise.

Well I am not sure how much fudging would be involved but I would think that if the Roms sat on their hands while the Klingons (who just sold them a bill of goods for a S173-T10 attack) are smacked around, that they may find themselves unable to deal with a much larger and stronger Fed fleet.

In fact I bet they would reason that once the Fed production schedule was
producing at full capacity they would indeed be out distanced in short order in terms of available firepower. They would have to get involved sooner to stop it. They might not even wait to see how things go, but rather just join the fray.

Then again it is only one year = two turns we are talking about.

That might make an interesting "normal" scenario. I wonder if it could be "balanced".

A quick check of the single PT assigned to Survey Duty, assuming no 11 or 12 is rolled, results in 5 extra provinces, and 110 extra EPs over the course of a 34 turn General War for 3 Survey Cruisers.

Even then with 3 bad rolls, it appears to result in 4 extra provinces and 100 EPs adjusted for economic exhaustion.

The assumption is that the PT is sent Off Map on turn 1 to begin on Turn 2. Also the PT is recieved for free.

The above is on the base 3 Survey Cruisers for the Kzintis and Lyrans. I used your base analysis and added the PT.

Thanks! That is very cool. I myself always send my very first PT to survey so I'm glad to see it is mathematically worth it. I appreciate the analysis. This Saturday I will actually have a couple of hours so I think I am going to sit down and crank out the When Do You Send Your SRs back OnMap. And maybe finally make a Federation survey table.

Christopher

I realize I never answered your question about optimal OnMap colonies. I have done such a thing (as have others). The only real ones to worry about it are the Lyrans and the Klingons since they can actually max out their colony sites (as opposed to the Feds and Romulans) and they can actually make safe colonies (as opposed to the Hydrans and Kzinti). As always I have ignored the poor Gorn, but they are used to it. I have also worked out the optimal colony path for placement (no missed turns, etc.). I'll look up my notes and post that tomorrow (hopefully) too.
I think I made a mistake in my initial post of PTs. It looks like it's 50 EP and 2 provinces. From back checking it, I got confused on the column I was reading from. Even then 50 EP make it worth it. And just a PT without any additional Survey Cruisers. The Klingons would benefit by almost as much with a SR built on turn 1 and Strat moved with the PT to the Lyran off map zone at the same time as the original two.

There's a maximum number of colonies??

There's a physical max that empire's can make do to space issues. Eventually you'll run out of places to put them.

Okay, first up. I just completed making a Federation chart just like the others I have made. Readable info is as before, but to repeat:

Column 1: Turn
Column 2-9: (Survey) Survey Points
Column 10-17: (Prov) Provinces gained (and yes, that is 30 on T34 for max SRs)
Column 18-25: (EP) EP from Surveyed Provinces
Column 26-32: (Diff) EP over Base Survey (7 SR)
Column 33-39: (# vs #) Incremental EP over 1 fewer SR

The Federation has 7 SRs to start out with. They also begin with 4xSR (3xCVL, COV) on map as the 2nd Fleet. So the Federation can (542.26) return those SRs to survey duty without any economic cost. Survey Ships 12, 13, and 14 (in the table +5, +6, and +7) cost the Federation the 5 EP for the conversion and 3 EP for the infrastructure cost and for ease of comparison with the 2nd Fleet are marked with a *. Consult columns 26-29 (1+EP through 4+EP) for if it is worth it to send the 2nd Fleet back to the OffMap. Economic exhaustion as well as Limited War on T7 are also included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federation</th>
<th>(7)Survey</th>
<th>1+Surv</th>
<th>2+Surv</th>
<th>3+Surv</th>
<th>4+Surv</th>
<th>5*+Surv</th>
<th>6*+Surv</th>
<th>7*+Surv</th>
<th>Prov</th>
<th>1+Prov</th>
<th>2+Prov</th>
<th>3+Prov</th>
<th>4+Prov</th>
<th>5*Prov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SRs are removed from the OffMap at the same time. You could swing this by 0.5

Executive Summary: Not including PT (will add later). Assumptions are that all SRs are removed from the OffMap at the same time. You could swing this by 0.5

Okay, Klingons.

Oh, and I did not add in the PT since Thomas has that (Thanks, BTW!, and I may include it myself in a future version with an amortized cost and survey points gained). Later today, I will post the turn to pull SRs to OnMap duty.

Okay, Klingons.

Executive Summary: Not including PT (will add later). Assumptions are that all SRs are removed from the OffMap at the same time. You could swing this by 0.5
EP per SR if you are on a province boundary (say you need 1 survey point to get one more province, remove all but 1 SR). In addition, you could build additional SRs and never send them to OffMap duty but then remember that the conversion costs 5 EP and thus the break even turn for that SR is T24! (this applies to all but the Fed and Gorn. The last turn for them to break even is T27).

Base Number of SRs (2): No income difference
One Additional SR (3): 2 EP if remove on T29
Two Additional SR (4): 1 EP if remove on T28-31
Three Additional SR (5): 3.5 EP if remove on T28

So if my calculations are correct, there is some utility in removing your SRs for the Klingons but not by much. But here is the big thing. The Klingons gain the least by pulling SRs from survey duty. This is because the more SRs you have, the more provinces you have. The more provinces you have, the more survey points necessary to get the next province. So by having fewer SRs, the Klingons get more EP per OffMap surveying SR at the end of the game*. OnMap survey is a flat rate EP per SR so empires with more SRs should proportionally benefit more by pulling their SRs sooner. That analysis follows in a bit...

* This incidentally is the same logic that results in the Klingons get more income per additional SR they build than any other Empire.

By Dale Lloyd Fields (Dylkha) on Saturday, May 02, 2009 - 08:16 pm: Edit

Executive Summary: Not including PT (will add later). Assumptions are 1) that all SRs are removed from the OffMap at the same time and 2) All survey rolls are average: roll of 3.5. You could swing this by 0.5 EP per SR if you are on a province boundary (say you need 1 survey point to get one more province, remove all but 1 SR). For the Fed and Gorn, this is 0.75 EP per SR. In addition, you could build additional SRs and never send them to OffMap duty but then remember that the conversion costs 5 EP and thus the break even turn for that SR is T24 (27 for Fed and Gorn).

Kitties: (Both Lyrans and Kzinti)

Base Number of SRs (3): 3.5 EP if remove on T28
One Additional SR (4): 3 EP if remove on T27-30
Two Additional SR (5): 6 EP if remove on T27
Three Additional SR (6): 8 EP if remove on T26-28

Hydrans:

Base Number of SRs (3): 0.5 EP if remove on T30
One Additional SR (4): 3 EP if remove on T27-30
Two Additional SR (5): 5.5 EP if remove on T28
Three Additional SR (6): 4 EP if remove on T27-29
Romulans:

Base Number of SRs (3): 1 EP if remove on T31  
One Additional SR (4): 2 EP if remove on T28-31  
Two Additional SR (5): 2 EP if remove on T29  
Three Additional SR (6): 6 EP if remove on T27-29  

Gorn:

Base Number of SRs (2): Never Worth It (EP loss!)  
One Additional SR (3): 2.25 EP if remove on T30  
Two Additional SR (4): 4.5 EP if remove on T28-30  
Three Additional SR (5): 2.25 EP if remove on T30  

The Federation are a weird case. They already have SRs on the map. And they can bring on more. I'm trying to think about how to handle that. I'm also trying to come up with a general equation that defines what the best time to remove the SRs is, but the problem is that that equation depends upon:

A) The Turn  
B) Economic Exhaustion  
C) The Number of SRs built  
D) The Number of Survey Points currently had  

and D) is the major problem because that really varies one game to another and is massively degenerate with C).

By Dale Lloyd Fields (Dylkha) on Saturday, May 02, 2009 - 08:44 pm: Edit

Jean

If you would, please delete my Federation chart posted today (02 May 2009 at 6:12pm) in this topic. There is an error in the later part of the chart and I am going to repost it with those errors fixed.

By Dale Lloyd Fields (Dylkha) on Saturday, May 02, 2009 - 08:47 pm: Edit

Okay, I just completed making a Federation chart just like the others I have made (and this one fixes the EP mistake I found). Readable info is as before, but to repeat:

Column 1: Turn  
Column 2-9: (Survey) Survey Points  
Column 10-17: (Prov) Provinces gained (and yes, that is 30 on T34 for max SRs)  
Column 18-25: (EP) EP from Surveyed Provinces  
Column 26-32: (Diff) EP over Base Survey (7 SR)  
Column 33-39: (# vs #) Incremental EP over 1 fewer SR
The Federation has 7 SRs to start out with. They also begin with 4xSR (3xCVL, COV) on map as the 2nd Fleet. So the Federation can (542.26) return those SRs to survey duty without any economic cost. Survey Ships 12, 13, and 14 (in the table +5, +6, and +7) cost the Federation the 5 EP for the conversion and 3 EP for the infrastructure cost and for ease of comparison with the 2nd Fleet are marked with a *. Consult columns 26-29 (1+EP through 4+EP) for if it is worth it to send the 2nd Fleet back to the OffMap. Economic exhaustion as well as Limited War on T7 are also included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federation</th>
<th>(7) Survey</th>
<th>1+Survey</th>
<th>2+Survey</th>
<th>3+Survey</th>
<th>4+Survey</th>
<th>5*+Survey</th>
<th>6*+Survey</th>
<th>7*+Survey</th>
<th>Prov</th>
<th>1+Prov</th>
<th>2+Prov</th>
<th>3+Prov</th>
<th>4+Prov</th>
<th>5*+Prov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>129.5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>150.5</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>122.5</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td>150.5</td>
<td>164.5</td>
<td>178.5</td>
<td>192.5</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>206.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>164.5</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>199.5</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>234.5</td>
<td>248.5</td>
<td>255.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>171.5</td>
<td>192.5</td>
<td>213.5</td>
<td>234.5</td>
<td>255.5</td>
<td>276.5</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>304.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>220.5</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>269.5</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>318.5</td>
<td>339.5</td>
<td>353.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>220.5</td>
<td>248.5</td>
<td>276.5</td>
<td>304.5</td>
<td>332.5</td>
<td>360.5</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>402.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>276.5</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>339.5</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>402.5</td>
<td>430.5</td>
<td>451.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>269.5</td>
<td>304.5</td>
<td>339.5</td>
<td>374.5</td>
<td>409.5</td>
<td>444.5</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>500.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>332.5</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>409.5</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>486.5</td>
<td>521.5</td>
<td>549.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>318.5</td>
<td>360.5</td>
<td>402.5</td>
<td>444.5</td>
<td>486.5</td>
<td>528.5</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>598.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>388.5</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>479.5</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>570.5</td>
<td>612.5</td>
<td>647.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>367.5</td>
<td>416.5</td>
<td>465.5</td>
<td>514.5</td>
<td>563.5</td>
<td>612.5</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>696.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>444.5</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>549.5</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>654.5</td>
<td>703.5</td>
<td>745.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>416.5</td>
<td>472.5</td>
<td>528.5</td>
<td>584.5</td>
<td>640.5</td>
<td>696.5</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>794.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>500.5</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>619.5</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>738.5</td>
<td>794.5</td>
<td>843.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>465.5</td>
<td>528.5</td>
<td>591.5</td>
<td>654.5</td>
<td>717.5</td>
<td>780.5</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>892.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To complete the Federation, as before...

Executive Summary: Not including PT (will add later). Assumptions are 1) that all SRs are removed from the OffMap at the same time and 2) All survey rolls are average: roll of 3.5. You could swing this by 0.75 EP per SR if you are on a province boundary (say you need 1 survey point to get one more province, remove all but 1 SR). In addition, you could build additional SRs and never send them to OffMap duty but then remember that the conversion costs 5 EP and thus the break even turn for that SR is T27.

Base Number of SRs (7): 14.75 EP if remove on T26
One Additional SR (8): 16.5 EP if remove on T26-T28
Two Additional SR (9): 13.75 EP if remove on T27
Three Additional SR (10): 12 EP if remove on T26-28
Four Additional SR (11): 20.75 EP if remove on T26
Five* Additional SR (12): 31 EP if remove on T25-26
Six* Additional SR (13): 27.25 EP if remove on T26
Seven* Additional SR (14): 34.5 EP if remove on T25-26

I think I'm about done for the day! Back to schoolwork...

* Ones you actually have to build new.

Okay, okay one final message for a while. Note that you get this additional money, but as a practical point, ask yourself if you are going to track which hexes have been surveyed for five turns and remember to move all your extra survey ships and allow them open to raids. It is up to you.
Thanks Dale,

What about bringing a SR on map to help lower the cost of colonies? That saves 1/2 ep per colony and in the turns it isn't doing that it could on map survey.

I'm to math challenged. Plus you've got the SS already.

By Christopher Scott Evans (Csevans) on Sunday, May 03, 2009 - 08:07 am: Edit

Dale, if you would post your notes about colony placement that would be both awesome and greatly appreciated!

Thank you.

By Thomas Mathews (Turtle) on Sunday, May 03, 2009 - 10:54 am: Edit

Ryan, you would more likely benefit from building a new SR for the purpose of building colonies or on map survey rather than bringing an existing SR from the off map area. The reasoning is the two (three?) turns it takes you to get the SR into position to begin on map fuctions. Where as building a new one and strategicly moving it into a nearby mode saves you atleast one turn, and in the case of colony building two turns.

As soon as I get Dale's chart completely updated(today?)with the addition of the Prime Team I will post it for everyone to see.

By Dale Lloyd Fields (Dylkha) on Sunday, May 03, 2009 - 05:17 pm: Edit

Chris

Okay, the main issue is no colonies can be places next to existing planets or colonies.

Lyrans: Basically, their space is bisected by the line of planets going from Degomark (0205) to Silmark (0801). They have a "north" and "south" area for colony placement. If you want to be true to the history, their placement is also affected by the WYN in 0804. I've gotten 8 colonies in the south and 10 in the north.

South: 0107, 0110, 0112, 0208, 0310, 0312, 0511 and the last in either 0413 or 0513.

Notes: putting the colony in 0413 is nice to upgrade underneath that BATS. But, 0112/0413 are only 6 hexes from the Old Colonies and 0312 and 0513 are both 7 hexes from the Old Colonies (if the Hydrans aren't raiding with their LGE they are doing something wrong).
North: 0101, 0104, 0202, 0301, 0304, 0402, 0405, 0501, 0504 and either 0605 or 0706.

Notes: These are a bunch safer in general because the Kzinti will be pushed away from these colonies instead of towards them in the case of the Hydrans. The Kzinti can reach 0501 and 0504 with a 7-hex raid.

Starting Notes: you can use TGs to start colonies even if they are in inactive fleets. So use the TGC in the Enemy's Blood to start a colony on T1 and you can use it on T4. The Lyrans can have three colonies being worked on at a time. You can start one in 0413 on T1 with the Enemy's Blood, and then start the T2 one on 0104 in the north, and then on T3 start 0107 in the south. Make a CONVOY for each (or use a TGP if you like). Degomark (0205) can build the CONVOY for both those starting spots. Those CONVOYs can then do all the rest, but I would suggest (if you start one T1 with the Enemy's Blood TGC). I would go:

T01: 0413 Enemy's Blood TGC
T02: 0104 CONVOY from 0205
T03: 0107 CONVOY from 0205
T04: 0706 TGP
T05: 0202 from 0104
T06: 0208 from 0107
T07: 0511 from 0706
T08: 0101 from 0202
T09: 0110 from 0208
T10: 0405 from 0511
T11: 0301 from 0101
T12: 0310 from 0110
T13: 0504 from 0405
T14: 0402 from 0301
T15: 0312 from 0310
T16: 0501 from 0504
T17: 0304 from 0402
T18: 0112 from 0312

This ends up with a TGP in 0501 (which is also the only vulnerable COLONY in the north) and a CONVOY each in 0304 and 0112, of which 0312 and 0112 might need to be protected against LGE raids. If the 2xBATS in the Enemy's Blood survive then use the fighters from it and the SB to assist in these hexes (leave a couple garrison POL in those provinces to help out). In fact, using POL to escort these CONVOY and to protect these COLONY sites are going to be the best use of the Lyran POL. In a touch, I will rewrite my Klingon chart to include timing.

By Dale Lloyd Fields (Dylkha) On Sunday, May 03, 2009 - 06:03 pm: Edit

Klingons
Ok, the Klingons are difficult in that they also have a string of planets bisecting Klingon space into a "north" and a "south" from Hildaria (0101) to Kypruss (2518). They also have a bunch of pockets. The secondary problem for the Klingons is that the Vudar will be seceding and I for one will be •••••• if they are going to get any of my hard-worked colonies! Also, you have to take into account Farlin (1407), Zursk (1506), Sherman's Planet (1910) and Bezwell Index (2214). I would **highly** recommend using pure TGs for this. Besides, the Klingons have tons of TGs (and lots of metric tons of TGs but I digress). And not enough money to be buying lots of CONVOY. Plus the pockets and such need something with a good movement range. But if you are going to buy a CONVOY do it with the south. The Tholian, SR and Hydran Border colonies are almost entirely 2 hexes from each other.

Kzinti Border: 0906, 0908, 1107, 1109, 1309, 1510, 1608, 1707, 1710, 1808
Fed Pocket 1: 1811
Fed Pocket 2: 2014
Fed Pocket 3: 2416
Hydran Border: 1013, 1214, 1415
Southern Reserve Pocket: 1615, 1717
Tholian Border: 1918, 2118, 2318, 2419
for a total of 22 colonies.

The Klingons are at a wartime economy on T1 and can start colonies on T2 (I think, someone review this).

With this schedule the East Fleet TGA is busy for 1 extra turn.

T02: 1811 with East Fleet TGA
T03: 1510 with Northern Reserve TGB
T04: 1717 with Southern Reserve TGB
T05: 2014 from 1811 with East Fleet TGA
T06: 1109 from 1510 TGB
T07: 1918 from 1717 TGB
T08: 1013 by new construction TGB (you have knocked the Hydrans back, right?)

T09: 0908 from 1109
T10: 2118 from 1918
T11: 1214 from 1013
Okay, if you are the Kzinti and/or Hydrans and happen to be the single best player in the Universe, your COLONY sites are:

**Kzinti:**

Lyran Border: 0701, and 0703/0802, and 0903/1003

Klingon Border: 1304 (I love the Duke's SB)

Federation Pocket 1: 1704 (under the Marquis) and 1805

Federation Pocket 2: 1901/2001

Core Pocket: 1701

for a total of 8 possible COLONY. If you could get these, you don't need my advice on timing.

**Hydran:**

Stupid Vudar!

Klingon Border: 0915, 0714, 0716, 0515

Lyran Border: 0219, 0318, 0118, 0216, 0315, 0114
for a total of 11 COLONY.

While the Federation and the Romulans can start two COLONY each turn (and thus have 6 going at a time) and both have plenty of space, I don't see the Romulans having the extra cash for the extra CONVOY.

I've never finished the Gorn (sorry), but I'll see about them a bit later.

Um. Amazing.

Thank you.

Dale:

Wouldn't you rather use Engineers, since you get a couple free?

John.

I personally don't. I like to have my engineering brigades giving me the most cost effective result possible. Since the maximum EP an ENG saves is 5 EP/turn, I want them working on products costing that or more. Which is why I love having ENG working on minor shipyards. These cost exactly 5 EP a turn which is perfect. So anytime I have ENG I send them off to minor shipyard duty the very first chance I have. Before that I tend to have them laying free PGBs. I really like the idea of supplementing my schedule with minor shipyards even if I don't use them because then I have options. In fact I wrote a whole TacNote about that the Hydrans now don't have to rebuild the whole shipyard, but only go to the Medium Shipyard (8 EP/turn instead of 15) which gives CAs and larger and then live off of the CW, DW, and FF slipways from the minor shipyards. This is especially useful for the Hydrans because if they pair up an FF slipway with a minor conversion facility, they can build an FF and convert it to a DW and save on building the DW straight out. It isn't even a burden have a delay between DWs becoming available and finishing the DW slipways!

Gorn

Okay, I squeezed in three more COLONY sites into Gorn space by making the deployment a more efficient packing scheme. However, this means that most of these sites are vulnerable. Frankly, while the Gorn are an EP-starved empire (as
opposed to a schedule-starved empire like the Lyrans) and thus the Gorn could really use the COLONYs, most of the sites are within striking distance of the Romulan border. Oh, and cloaked raiders. "You didn't want that COLONY, did you?" says the SPG (I love that ship). But there are sites. Note that the Lyran and Klingons have more defendable COLONY sites than the ones I gave, but I wanted to list the most efficient orientation. Same with the Gorn:

Fed Pocket: 3801
Capital Pocket: 4501
Pavarian Pocket: 4901, 5101, 5202, 5204
Romulan Border: 4301/4201, 4003, 4203/4202, 4105, 4305, 4505, 4006, 4206 (SB), 4406, 4606 (SB), 5006, 4008/4108, 4508, 4708, 4908.
Max COLONY: 20

Fortunately, many of these do fall under BATS. Once you annex the Neutral Zone hexes you can start plopping down colonies in:

NZ Extension: 5301, 5501, 5602, 5701, 5901, 6101 but that won't happen until you have at least 10 turns so turn 22 at the start and then T25 before they start producing income and you are almost at economic exhaustion. Sorry Gorn.

By Lee Hanna (Lee) on Monday, May 04, 2009 - 01:34 pm: Edit

Thanks for this, Dale. I have started the 3-convoy route in "Wild Wild West," but I will now review my plans, beginning with Turn 4. I did start on Turn 2, and no one called me on it yet.

By Thomas Mathews (Turtle) on Monday, May 04, 2009 - 06:22 pm: Edit

Didn't see anything wrong at all with it Lee.

By Thomas Mathews (Turtle) on Tuesday, May 05, 2009 - 06:37 am: Edit

I didn't see anything wrong with it Lee, unless you can't start colonies in an unreleased the area of an unreleased fleet.

I didn't see anything about that in the Colony rules though.

By Ryan Opel (Ryan) on Tuesday, May 05, 2009 - 06:54 am: Edit

You can start colonies in unreleased fleet areas. In fact you can use that fleets unreleased tug if you want to. The Feds do that in the 5th Fleet area.

By Bill Stec (Billstec2) on Tuesday, May 05, 2009 - 07:14 am: Edit

And note that colonies set up in the same location as a starbase and upgraded to Colonial Base contribute their 8 compot to the base's defense. Especially if you
put 2 PDU on that colony.

Here’s the chart for 3 Survey Cruisers with a PT assigned on Turn 2. Total EP is adjusted for Economic Exhaustion beginning Turn 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Die Roll</th>
<th>Prov</th>
<th>Total EP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>110.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>135.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>160.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>210.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>159.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>235.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>186.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>260.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>201.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>216.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>285.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>231.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>310.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>264.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>275.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>335.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>287.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>299.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More of a tactics question than strategy. As a Klingon, what relative value would you all put on a D7A? I'm heading into a battle over a Hydran SB, and as best I can figure, if he fights with the SB, I will be at a significant ComPot disadvantage.

The way it seems to break down to me, I will likely get cheap shots at 2 of his ships (not likely the ones I want, that is, the biggest ones), and he will have more than enough points to blow it away.

Is it worth it to commit such a rare unit to an SB assault? Should it be held out for non-base actions (pin battles or approaches), or at least ones in which I can inflict much more damage?

As I understand it, the Coalition goal is to blast hulls in the early game, but I can't tell if this is a good trade or not. Opinions?

---

I try to keep my stasis ships in the reserve fleets. If the Hydrans mount an attack, then they have to choose between risking the good units or putting expendable stuff on the line for one round to kill the stasis cruiser, which could be enough to keep them from winning the battle.

Offensively, they're useful in open space battles. Fighting over any kind of fixed defenses is wasteful. In my opinion, of course.

---

> I personally don't. I like to have my
> engineering brigades giving me the most cost
> effective result possible. Since the maximum EP
> an ENG saves is 5 EP/turn, I want them working
> on products costing that or more. Which is why
> I love having ENG working on minor shipyards.
> These cost exactly 5 EP a turn which is
> perfect. So anytime I have ENG I send them off
> to minor shipyard duty the very first chance I
> have. Before that I tend to have them laying
> free PGBs. I really like the idea of
>supplementing my schedule with minor shipyards
>even if I don't use them because then I have
>options.

The only safe place to build Hydran colonies is off map and you need five new provinces to get a new colony site. That is achieved nine turns after surveying is started with three survey cruisers.

Four points.

1) It takes five turns for an Engineer to build a colony in the survey area. One turn to travel to the survey area colony site, three turns to build it, one turn to travel back.

2) Getting an off-map colony on turn 14 will pay 11.5 EP and 1.5 XTP by turn 34 versus the construction cost opportunity cost of 20 EP lost.

3) You can use a survey cruiser for one turn of colony production, saving one EP, and one turn of Engineering Brigade output, lowering the opportunity cost to 16 EP

4) You get a free PGR from Guild production to do it.

5) If you don't have the cash to use the minor shipyard(s) that the Eng brigade built, it is not an opportunity cost.

I tend to agree with Derek on this issue. Putting them in RESV are probably the best general choice. I would still bring them to a SB battle against the Hydrans, though (if there are lots of cruisers and not so many frigates). The big question is: Does he have enough stuff in the hex to put up a non-cruiser line? If he does, then DO NOT bring them to a SB battle. He'll kill off your stasis ships and not suffer anything in consequence (even if you freeze his DDs or escorts, the SB will certainly give him enough damage to blow through your goodies. If your opponent is relying upon the fact that he has a SB to cause you to choose not to direct and thus is packed with CAs, then bring 'em. You'll lose them more easily than in open space (the best choice for you), but the morale win in confounding his expectations might be worth it.

As a side note, consider killing all the Hydran G-ships you can find. Tripling the chance of capturing a stasis ship is not worth it. I've done it. As the Hydrans. More than once.

By Alan De Salvio (Alandwork) on Tuesday, May 19, 2009 - 08:31 pm: Edit

By all means bring them to a starbase battle (any battle). Their simple presence
should affect your opponent's battleforce selection in a way you can predict, and that is always good for you and bad for your opponent.

Having the SFG ships available affects the Hydran's ship selection. Just for that they can be worth having in a SB hex. Nothing says you have to use them until you want to use them.

Personally as a Hydran player, over a SB I'm going to give you the cruisers every time if I have em. I'll dial the SB to guarantee an EW shift if I have to at that point, and the Hydrans can afford to do it since their cruiser lines are better than the best Coalition line anyway, so a SB at 6 EW isn't really a "bad" thing for them. Meaning the Hydrans should still be outgunning the Coalition by a decent amount.

Personally, as the "subject Hydran" Lee is talking about, I would much rather fight D7As at a SB than anywhere else.

At least there I'm sure to be able to make sure it only shoots once, I may have an EW advantage, and I may actually be able to do all of this while using a carrier line.

And in this particular battle, I may be able to +2 shift his mauler rolls. "Total disaster" becomes a very real possibility if more than one attempt is made, and even the first attempt isn't better than a 50/50 prospect for the D7A attempting to freeze something.

(Although Lee brought maulers to the battle, at least one penal ship, and the two D7A, curiously there was not a D6S or D5S within range of the SB.)

Ewww, hadn't noticed that unfriendly EW mattered. This decision got a lot easier.

Whoops, just read my typo. Change that to +2 shift his *stasis* rolls.

I kinda like the +2 shift to the 'mauler roll' concept though.

"I maul your cruiser to death."

"Roll for it."

"$@*%!!!"
"Total Disaster, eh? Ok, your mauler *and every other ship in your battleforce* is crippled, your admiral commits suicide, and civil war breaks out on your capital. And chickens refuse to lay eggs for three turns."

"I hate these new mauler rules. Can we just go back to when you'd whang me over the head with a frying pan. That hurt less."

By Dale Lloyd Fields (Dylkha) On Thursday, May 21, 2009 - 12:41 am: Edit

I had not thought about the ability to EW yank the SB after seeing the stasis line. Remove my support of use a stasis ship against a SB force, and replace it with bring a stasis ship against a SB force and see if the Hydran screws up.

By Derek Meserve (Sepeku) On Thursday, May 21, 2009 - 09:25 am: Edit

A stasis ship could be useful if there is an approach battle, but that would be classified as the Hydran screwing up.

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) On Thursday, May 21, 2009 - 06:00 pm: Edit

Yeah the Hydran giving you the cruisers in approach with a stasis ship in the enemy force is a "bad idea" with a capital BAD.

By Paul Howard (Raven) On Saturday, May 23, 2009 - 07:15 am: Edit

Just to add to the SB/SFG debate - even taking into account the SB's EW, if the Coalition can ensure a zero (or positive Coalition EW effect), the SFG may be worth using still.

The Hydrans are the weakest of the EW Empires, and so a good Coalition line should still equal or out EW them (SB+TG/SP = 5-10 EW v 3 x D6D and a D6S = 10 EW).

If the EW war is already lost (no main Coalition Scouts there for example) - keep it to threaten the Hydrans in the retreat battle (even if you don't use it!).

As several have mentioned, a Mauler/SFG/Good Scout Reserve Fleet is where SFG ships want to end up though!

By Robert Padilla (Zargan) On Saturday, May 23, 2009 - 10:43 am: Edit

Don't forget that by the time the Hydrans enter the war, they will have 3xPGS' available, so don't count them out! And if the Hydran wants to use the SB as the flagship, they can put a second scout tug in formation.

By Kevin Howard (Jarawara) On Tuesday, July 28, 2009 - 04:21 pm: Edit

OK, I have a question on how people play the Hydrans. I know that some have stated they like sticking to cruiser warfare throughout the war, while most build carriers.

The question I have is "How many carriers, when, and what?"
So, por favor, for anyone who wishes to help out a Hapless Hydran, how many carriers do you build when you play the Hydrans? At what point do you say enough is enough, and just maintain what you have? What do you build, and when do you build them?

Be as specific as you could, as I'm not only trying to get an idea of what I should be doing, but also to have a general consensus of what the Hydrans would most often be building during a war.

And yes, I presume that most games see the loss of the Hydran capital, so that puts a dent in the production rate. ;)

Thanks in advance for any who can contribute!

I was convinced a while back to build cruisers and cruisers only. This is not the 'historical' account as such, but the Hydran escorts aren't as thick as other races...sorta. But the point is the alternative is more RNs, HRs, etc, which can put a lot more fighters in your battle forces. Now, when the ID and/or IC come about, then yes, I will build escorts for those. But the UH...no way; I use is as a FCR to refill my cruisers.

That's a simple opinion. There are probably numbers hashed out by people with more time than me, but I took someone's advice a while back and it worked our pretty good when I play the Hydrans.

Here are my thoughts, but with the caveat that they aren't necessarily the "best" way or even necessarily a "good" way.

Consider this force:

PAL (+ADM) form and flag. CV+NEC(PT)+NEC+AH, LNHV+NEC(PT)+NEC+AH, TGV+NEC+CR, NSC as free scout.

That force is 110 compot with 51 fighters, and the opponent needs 36 damage to kill the NSC, 44 to kill the Pal (assuming a mauler) and 50 to kill the TGV group (again, with a mauler.) Against most typical coalition forces, you won't see line capable of scoring that kind of damage (the 44 or 50) until and unless you try to take out defended hardpoints.

If they try to cripple any one of those, to try to kill it in pursuit later, then they have to wait you out and run you out of fighters to get to that point.

So, most times coalition will simply vaporize an escort to drive the group off the line.
If you have enough carriers on T15 or so, you can make enough variation of that line to really make yourself a nuisance.

But even this line is pretty effective:

PAL+ADM form and flag, CV+DE+DE+CU, UH+DE+DE+CU, TGV+DE+CU. PGS in free scout.

You leave two fighter from the UH out of the battle to meet the 3 squadron limit, and you still have 88 compot. With nothing good to shoot at, the coalition simply won't stay to fight.

It's definately lower compot than the cruiser line, but vastly more durable. You drive them away in disgust. A cruiser-based strategy is going to cause some pain for the coalition, but it's short term pain, because once they've "bitten the bullet" to drain the Hydrans of their cruisers, the Hydrans are left an empty shell, and are easily contained.

So, the answer to your question becomes this:

• Build enough carriers such that by the time you're driven out of your capital, you can use the "carrier line" to counter-punch.

• Build the IC when available.

• Take the free PGV as soon as you can.

• Build the LNHV's when able.

• Build a few more ID to provide flagships for multiple battle hexes.

This strategy will have you with over 10 good carrier groups by T15 or so, which is when you should see the alliance really start to push back against the coalition.

Mostly I fight Hydrans. I can tell you what is VERY annoying to fight. Two overstuffed true carrier groups, of whatever kind, with an inner escort that carries fighters and two outer AH. The compot is very low (80-90; 100+ later as you get the IC), but basically you can easily field more than 30 or even 40 fighters.

The Coalition, especially early, cannot field lots of fighters. That means that for a number of rounds I take cripples and the Hydran takes fighters - unless I want to direct kill very cheap AHS. Heck, my Hydran opponent often puts plain old hunters as ad hoc outer escorts. "Go ahead and kill them," he says.
And I do, because otherwise he is losing only fighters and then leaves. He can do this once per player turn, and that's *alot* of cripples for me and little damage to him.

Of course, the Hydran cruisers are nice, so if I want to pursue when I cripple an odd ship he can put up a MONSTER line. So usually, I don't pursue unless I can get something really juicy like a PAL or LGE or BT or something along those lines.

Oh, and I should also mention that carriers are also highly resistant to maulers and SFG units.

So, the basic answer is it doesn't matter WHAT carriers you field, so long as they are true carriers and you put two of them up there with more than 30 fighters. Heck, I've seen my opponent field a simple overstuffed CV group and UH group and pull this off. Now that he's got an ID and an IC, it's getting worse - but fortunately by now (C13) I've got a lot more carriers in the region myself so that I can take a lot of the damage on fighters.

Still, the basic doctrine of the Hydran is to have at least two good carriers and then spend EPs replacing the escorts as they get burned.

You do lose one thing with this tactic: space. The Coalition can outlast you, unless he is stupid, even if he is taking cripples and spending EPs on repairs. However, in the grand scheme of things, the Hydran's job is to constantly bleed the Coalition while maintaining a very strong threat with a good fleet. Don't expect a "war of return" until very late in the general war - if ever. Concentrate on ways to make the Coalition pay more than you do for every single fight - and you will find that with two carrier groups (even with low compots against high compots) that is easy to do.

By Lawrence Bergen (Lar) on Wednesday, July 29, 2009 - 02:04 pm: Edit

Maybe Ted you have hit the nail indirectly on the head.

When it became possible to overstuff carrier groups it became harder to kill them. This lead to the non carrier races calling for a fix the "unkillable" carriers. Maybe instead of all this discussion about how to fix the game by adding more rules and more restrictive play we should look at what has happened and remove the problem rules like overstuffed carriers groups. We do have a limit about how many escorts can be placed into a group. Why is this number the rule? Why can it not just be the original limit of the group? There would be more kills, more cripples, and more death and destruction which we all enjoy.

Lets discuss this over in General Discuss as not to clutter Strategy.

By Roger Rardain (Sky_Captain) on Wednesday, July 29, 2009 - 10:07 pm: Edit

Speaking of Hydrans and fighters:
Last Saturday, Dan Knipfer, Dale Fields, myself and a new guy (Ed Somethingorother) started to play The Tempest (602.0).

Of course, there was an assault on Hydrax (I was the Hydran). I don't remember all the details, but Hydrax fell (duh). Hydran losses included a PAL (directed on by the Coalition), crippled LN and KN (in honor duels with Klingon Penal ships) and all the associated ground bases, SB, etc.

Oh, and the 368 fighters there.

I used **every** fighter in the hex.

By Kevin Howard (Jarawara) on Thursday, July 30, 2009 - 12:38 am: Edit

And I'm sure the Klingons used every fighter they had too....

...all 15? of them? :P hehehehe....

Thanks everyone for the replies. I'm curious, though, once you have the force you wanted built up, do you continue to add to it as newer carriers come along? An example above cites that by T15, I should have about 10 or so carriers. While certainly I should add a SCS and PFT's to that when they come available, should I also try to build several CVM's, or do you usually just maintain the CV's you have till the end of the war?

Too many carriers, and you'll find yourself unable to escort them all, or even force a battle long enough to use all the fighters.

By Paul Howard (Raven) on Thursday, July 30, 2009 - 07:59 am: Edit

"Oh, and the 368 fighters there."

The Klingon in me would say...but 180-240 those fighters will never come back (from the PDU's and SB).

....and hopefully the Coalition brought 50+ fighters themselves they used up.

But the Hydran in me would say - 'let them burn for what they did' 😁

Kevin - I would guess most games don't get to turn 15...so what the Hydrans do in practice will probably be different to the theory.

However, saying that, once they do get to 10 carrier groups, each additional group has less value (as you can't use them all). So yes, you build a good new carrier,
and move the escorts from an inferior group (UH for example) on to it - you gain half a dozen compot, and get FCR/emergency carrier (a UH+HR+CU is better than risking 3 Cruisers for example...).

If Ep's are in reasonable supply - you build good new escorts (DWE's as the second light escort for example) - although, the DE is an excellent escort you start with!

You are not entirely right... Four reasons.

1) The coalition can play the stuffed carrier game too.. By the time the hydran carriers get going (note the hydrans only start with TGVs and auxiliaries), the coalition will have enough carriers on the hydran front to have at least one stuffed carrier line.

So... Coalition counter tactic 1 - you can afford to lose F5Es more than he can afford to lose AHs.

2) Scouts *do* become a problem. 36 to kill a PGS or NSC is actually not that difficult. And if the hydrans don't put up scouts, they quickly find themselves staring at -2 shifts. With the coalition using minus points, this can result in embaressing attrition battles where the coalition loses just a few fighters and 1 cripple for killing an AH/HN in return. When the coalition runs out of fighters, they retreat.

3) Pin count is vital. With the coalition usually outnumbering you heavily, they can decide when and where to fight. Hydran strikes will often get pinned out, and the resulting combat ends up being 1 round - coalition takes 1-2 cripples and fighters (running out), - Hydrans lose HN, then coalition retreats. Sometimes the Hydrans might get to a viable target like a BATS, but even that's dodgy, as with a BATS in support, the coalition knows that the Hydrans will be trying to kill the BATS, and will put up a big line that might be able to bag a PAL or TGV group.

On the coalition turn, you will find that the coalition will initially pin out Hydran fleet elements (see battle above) and hit everywhere where the Hydran fleet isn't. Latterly when there are fewer targets, the coalition will group fighters into one main strike force which may include all their auxes (safe to use due to better pincount), and match the hydrans fighter for fighter in one winning SB battle say while avoiding elsewhere. And finally, at the capital, the coalition run through all the Hydran fighters, taking the pain once only, in order to devastate and capture the capital.

I have found that against a good player, it is actually increadibly difficult to use all
the Hydran fighters you have.

4) The low compot carrier lines latterly might simply not cut the mustard. If the coalition goes really big with maulers, DNIs, D6Ds, 2 SFGs, the whole kaboodle, against a modest overstuffed PAL/CV/UH/NSC line, the hydrans may bag a SFG ship, but they are quite likely to lose the UH or PAL. If the coalition had minus points from the previous round, the SFG ship may even survive. These kind of unequal battles can easily happen in rearguard Hydran actions after the fall of the capital, the coalition again using their pincount advantage to decide where and how to hit.

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Monday, August 03, 2009 - 10:41 am: Edit

---

1) The coalition can play the stuffed carrier game too.. By the time the hydran carriers get going (note the hydrans only start with TGVs and auxiliaries), the coalition will have enough carriers on the hydran front to have at least one stuffed carrier line.

Counter-counter. Coalition escorts don't have fighters. Many Hydran escorts do. Unless the coalition is fielding CVDs you are limited to 18 fighters, whereas the Hydran is putting up 30+. Also, the Coalition probably does not have the same total number of fighters, which is pretty important in these Hydran grinds.

2) Scouts *do* become a problem. 36 to kill a PGS or NSC is actually not that difficult. And if the hydrans don't put up scouts, they quickly find themselves staring at -2 shifts. With the coalition using minus points, this can result in embarassing attrition battles where the coalition loses just a few fighters and 1 cripple for killing an AH/HN in return. When the coalition runs out of fighters, they retreat.

Scouts are not that big a deal because the total damage he does is not that important (unless you have lots of fighters (see below). Not that scouts don't matter (they do, and you should maintain an EW advantage over the Hydran to minimize your losses).

Also, if you field too many fighters, the Hydran will burn your escorts or other ships, again bleeding you (which is what you don't want). Which brings me to your second point of "just retreat." Yes, that would work - but fairly frequently you need to force him back, and thus must outlast him.
3) Pin count is vital. With the coalition usually outnumbering you heavily, they can decide when and where to fight. Hydran strikes will often get pinned out, and the resulting combat ends up being 1 round - coalition takes 1-2 cripples and fighters (running out), - Hydrans lose HN, then coalition retreats. Sometimes the Hydrans might get to a viable target like a BATS, but even that's dodgy, as with a BATS in support, the coalition knows that the Hydrans will be trying to kill the BATS, and will put up a big line that might be able to bag a PAL or TGV group.

Yes, pin is vital. However, the Hydran can certainly force *a* battle *somewhere* - which is the point: Bleed the Coalition. The Coalition can partially control this by not attacking on his turn, but that is not always possible as you need to push the Hydran back for some reason (to secure strategic movement, for example).

Also pin count advantage also plays to the Hydran strategy of drawing ships to fight Hydrans instead of those Coalition ships fighting Feds.

The Hydran can further increase this part of the "Hydran Annoyance Factor" (TM) by liberal use of reserve fleets and pickets. To maintain sufficient pincount to clean up pickets and not get creamed, you have even more ships fighting Hydrans and not Feds.

I have found that against a good player, it is actually increadibly difficult to use all the Hydran fighters you have. You don't have to. You just need to chew through a bunch of them.

4) The low compot carrier lines latterly might simply not cut the mustard. If the coalition goes really big with maulers, DNs, D6Ds, 2 SFGs, the whole kaboodle, against a modest overstuffed PAL/CV/UH/NSC line, the hydrans may bag a SFG ship, but they are quite likely to lose the UH or PAL. If the colaition had minus points from the previous round, the SFG ship may even survive. These kind of unequal battles can easily happen in rearguard Hydran actions after the
fall of the capital, the coalition again using their pincount advantage to decide where and how to hit.

That's not my experience fighting Hydrans. They don't put up the PAL in the first place unless there's a monster line, or unless you don't have a mauler/SFG ship in the hex (whereupon the Pal goes into the form box where it probably can't be hurt at BIR 5, which he can force). Bagging an overstuffed UH is almost certainly not going to happen when the Hydran picks BIR 1, even with a 120 compot line, and the SFG can only bag the outer escort.

Don't get me wrong, I never said that Hydrans were unbeatable. The question asked was how to play Hydrans, and I'm simply stating what I have seen (experienced) to be the most effective use of Hydrans. Their job is not to dominate, but to fight a guerilla war that draws not only numbers of units, but quality units, and EPs away from fighting the Zin and the Feds (even the Gorn later in the war). Hydrans can do this *extremely* well using the overstuffed carrier groups, even if the compot of their lines blow chunks.

Here's what I have been doing (or will be doing) to counter this tactic to the best of my abilities (and I have been doing a very bad job of it until now, when I finally realized what I needed to do).

1) Fighters, lots of fighters. Use your AUX CVs in Hydran space, especially, where you have confined the bulk of the Hydran fleet to a place where the AUX CVs can usually reach them. Remember that getting enough fighters to fully counter the Hydrans is not productive, as then you are taking them away from the Fed and Zin. However, eventually you will want a C8V and a D6U group (minimum) to maximize fighters on the line. Total fighter count should be at least half of the Hydran, probably 75%. Remember, the Hydran probably won't burn through all of his fighters, or else he will be vulnerable to more damage and especially on pursuit.

2) Maintain 1-2 maulers and a SFG ship in reserve; i.e., don't put them up on the line. If he puts up something juicy in the form box (like a PAL or a scout), cripple it if you can and then bag it with a mauler/SFG on pursuit. A mauler plus SFG in pursuit will also discourage Hydran monster pursuit lines somewhat.

3) Don't pursue, unless you are going to bag something juicy or you can certainly bag multiple ships. The classic Hydran ploy is to cripple a single inner escort (which you can't target on pursuit), gull you into pursuing, and then ruining your 6 ships with a monster line.

4) Always maintain a substantial pin count advantage. If you don't, the Hydran
will eventually make a run on the Lyran capital by pinning you out of a supply hex.

5) Kill, kill, kill. It might be irritating to always go after the small fry, but the Hydran still has to replace them and you can keep his economy down.

6) If you cripple a juicy target and the Hydran is sticking around, then start *crippling* the small fry (don't kill them). If the enemy doesn't self kill them (meaning he's killing more fighters since you used less on DD), then they will swell the ranks of cripples on pursuit and he can't put up a monster line. If he gets away, at least he's spending precious EPs repairing them.

7) If you have taken the Hydran capital, establish a double starbase on 617. Then, shift units around the various theaters until the bulk of your fleet is filled with total crap (E4s, etc.), but you have enough good stuff for at least two battle rounds of good lines. Still maintain pincount superiority, obviously. This way, you can keep the Hydrans away from anything important (or attack them if they try setting up a supply point to go after the Lyrans), but they can't outlast you on a double SB. However, the good stuff can then be redirected to fight Feds and/or Kzin.

If anyone has better ideas, I am *all* ears. However, my experience is that this Hydran strategy is extremely effective at its *intended goal* - to bleed the Coalition and to force substantial resources to the Southwest at the expense of resources sent North and East.

As the Hydrans, I build everything I can, including a solitary UH group, as long as I can make my economy last. Sure, that UH is hideous on offense, but on defence, it's an awesome casualty absorber. I tend not to build too many Hydran true CVs, though, mostly because I need the hulls on the line all the time.

I have played Hydrans a lot and all of the above comments are good.

First build all the ships you can. Build TR's and convert it to what you want later. This will save you 3EPs rather than building HRs. Never build DWs always convert them from FFs. You are usually using DWs as DWS and DWEs. This saves 0.5EP per DW converted because of the double conversion.

I tend to have two Hydran lines.
1) All cruisers and I try to convert the LC and all the DGs to LBs. Yes you only get 1 COMPLOT but you also get 1 defense
too which makes a difference. I leave the RNs alone and use them as 2/3 FCRs when ever possible. By turn 8-10 you should be able to put up a line of PAL, 10xLB.

2) You start with 2 CV PODS so there is two carrier groups. Also a UH is build in PWC. I like to build 2 CV Groups. With PGVs you will have another 4 CVs. So eventually you will have 9 CV groups total. I don't usually build any DN CV groups. (maybe the IC if I'm off map.) You will not need more than these 9 CV groups until you get to OV. I always tend to build a couple of extra escorts for my CV groups to go where ever they go. That way if a CV group loses a escort or two you have backups right in the battle hex.

Also a UH is build in PWC.

Is it?

The UH may be built on Turn 3, not in PWC. For me, its a tough choice whether to build it or not and wait for the CVs to become available on Turn 5. I usually do, but then again I only play basic F&E, so I get no CV-Tug groups.

I always build everything I can, even the UH, while I still have the economy. Having those extra 11 ftrs hanging around means an extra battle round or two I can stay in a fight, or, if things have gone wrong, the 32 or so damage the UH group + ftrs can absorb is a great boon. I do tend to build CVAs, at least 2-3, as the core of a fleet. Oddly enough, I don't build many, if any, of the other true CVs, preferring instead to take them as base hulls.

I generally find I can spend the free fighter factors on things more useful than a UH. Usually a gaggle of DEs to escort TGVs/LAVs, the fighters for the activated PAL (I think it needs to pay for fighters), and some hybrid cruisers like RNs.

In other words, my "UH" is acutally the pre-existing LAV. Sure, it sucks in terms of manoeuvrability, but neither carrier really has much in the way of useful offensive compot, and in either case, they may be best used simply by sitting at the capital, maybe being the crucial extra element allowing the Hydrans to defend that extra side system on turns 4-6.

The Lav also has the bonus that you can stick in another escort as it is a heavy carrier.

IIRC, the activated PAL has a discount on the fighters due to reserve units being
activated. I still maintain building the UH is a valid decision, if for no other reason than it's likely to be the last, if not next to last, time the Hydrans will be able to build their full production. The UH is purely defensive, acting as a casualty soak and/or fighter transport.

Well, my 6 free fighter factors Fall 169 usually goes this way

Construction
DG->TG (1 FFF)
DE (1.5FFF)
UH->DE (1.5FFF)

Somewhere in conversions
4LN->DE (2FFF)

The free fighter factors in Y170 are mainly used by an RN->CV conversion in the autumn, a TG having been substituted for the RN in spring.

I guess an aggressive hydran might not choose to field the V-pods, and therefore would need fewer escorts. So an alternative is:-

Construction
UH (6FFF + 4EP for fighters paid)
DE (3EP for fighters paid)
2AH

No conversions using FFF - instead DG->LB or HN->SC type conversions.

You then start ramping up LN->DE conversions next year as you get more tugs to pull your V-pods

However, note that the second option involves quite a few more Eps.

The third option would technically be not to build destroyers at all...

Construction
UH->HN->SC
DE->CR (think that is allowed)
2AH

Somewhere in conversions
2LN->UH+DE (6FFF + 3EP for fighters paid)

But this is disallowed as the UH cannot be built by conversion until Y170
I have generally as the Coalition forced the Hydrans off map entirely, and then keep them that way by plunking 95% of the guarding fleet right at the off map border. Intercept anything that comes out and make them retreat off map afterwards. While this does mean fighting until the Hydran wants to leave, there is no combat on the coalition turn, and you maintain (barring raids) full control of the captured hyran economy.

I will generally put up a ~120 point line and toss in the full 12 points of drone bombardment. 130 odd compot means without 35 or more fighters, you can often just let the hyran take the damage and cripple a bunch of stuff. If they stay around too long, there will be a juicy pursuit. If they do not, yay, less damage to me. Another important advantage to over-compotting, is that you can force large carrier groups off the line quicker. Once they have lost an escort or crippled two, you may just be able to outright cripple the remaining group with a half decent roll. Then it is another juicy pursuit. Even without that, killing Lots of fighters in addition to directing a small escort generally means the Hydrans leave a round or two earlier, which is less damage again.

I put almost every Lyran/Klingon carrier on Hydran/Kzinti watch, which helps a lot too.

You cannot stop the Hydrans (or Kzinti) from making you pay for repairs/replace ships/lose some EP's, but I have not really found either able to bleed the Coalition enough to be a big problem. Until very late in the game at least, presuming the Coalition has not taken three capitals before then.

Part of my problem is that I do not think either my old Alliance players or I (as I basically just play solo now) have really figured out how to play the Alliance really well or counter the overwhelming compot advantage the coalition can throw at them all over the place.

That's why I don't play the UH really. It's compot is just anaemic. You need something better if you are going to pay for it. Even a LAV has more compot than a UH and is also more durable as you can stick in an extra escort.

Oddly enough, I've rarely had a problem staying on-map as the Hydrans. I even manage to keep the capital about 30% of the time. A good deal of the reason is because my Coalition opponent concentrates on the Kzin, then the Feds, but even so, it's not easy staying on map as the Hydrans, and its very difficult retaining control of the capital.

I did look at escorting the LAV, but my rather fuzzy recollection is there was a reason I didn’t. Probably due to the speed.
To truly kick the Hydrans offmap you need about double the SE of the Hydran navy. Otherwise, there are just too many wonky games he can play with operational movement. Probably not worth it, given how badly you'll need those 80+ ships in the other theaters.

The problem with the LAV as a carrier is that it has 2 SE worth of fighters. Therefore your line is LAV group, a CVT group, and 4-5 other ships. you could use a battle group, but then you are losing a DD or CW hull instead of a FF hull, which is the point to winning the exchange in the carrier duel. The Uhlan is a reasonable group to fill out a line (UH, CVT, CVT), but I normally only build one of them. I build the CV group and then wait until I get a PGV or CVA before building more. A CVA has the same issue as the LAV for combat, but with significantly more compot/staying power. It can field a CVA/(CV or UH group with each group being overstuffed with escort to get its 10 ship count.

The LAV does this early

PAL [LAV-DE-DE-DE-AH][TGV-DE-DE-AH]SC [TGT-SP or SC]
compot 84 + scout fighters

Later on it does this

PAL [LAV-DE-DE-DE-AH][CV-DE-DE-DE-AH] (no scout?).

Compot 92

One might substitute AHs for DEs if you need more lasting power.

These lines tend to sit on the capital, defending the capital itself or sidesystems

Part of it is also the DEs. You can break up the LAV group, and perhaps couple some DEs with SAVs in an attack, reuniting them with the LAV upon retrograde. Basically you have a pool of DEs with which you escort the appropriate aux carrier.

As to TGV-DE-AH groups, I find their use perilous against good coalition players. Unless you are defending a base with them, they have a habit of dying. 26 to cripple with mauler and then 9 to kill with mauler in pursuit is disturbingly easy for a coalition reserve fleet. They kind of need an extra DE for safety, whereupon you will need admiral and command point to get two TGV and the UH in the same battleforce.
That was part of it! The fighter limit. That's part of why I prefer to use UHs. Well, the single UH 😊. I don't like incorporating slow units of any kind as an integral part of my fleet because I don't want to be slowed down. I do tend to escort the TGVs later on with surplus escorts and use them as part of the reserve as needed, or for small detachments.

By Henry Frank (Bubba) on Wednesday, August 19, 2009 - 02:38 pm: Edit

If you guys like fighters so much why try to limit them to the point that they are worthless with all these 2010 changes?

By John Doucette (Pbi) on Wednesday, August 19, 2009 - 03:32 pm: Edit

When I first started playing, there were no FFF, then FFF got introduced, then annuity, and now they're looking at getting rid of/reducing FFF. I don't mind the per-turn FFF; in fact, I like it. I also find it reasonable to reduce or eliminate FFF once PFs come online.

By Derek Meserve (Sepeku) on Wednesday, August 19, 2009 - 04:56 pm: Edit

The biggest drawback of an LAV group is that it's by itself in the slow unit pursuit (or with a bunch of other slow units, which don't survive well). To make matters worse, each escort that stays with it is another ship which can be in the battle force chasing it down.

By Peter Bonfanti (Otherbonfanti) on Friday, September 11, 2009 - 03:39 pm: Edit

This is a straight-up poll question, but I'm curious about whether any consensus exists:

Say that a Kzinti fleet with three DNs, six CV groups, and a bunch of other ships (including many smaller carriers and lots of warships with CR9 or lower) are attacking a Coalition SB with the obvious intent of destroying it.

Given an adequate supply of maulers, the Coalition could likely destroy a form-bonused DN for 44 points each combat round, or a CV group for 54 points. Then again, they could just let the damage fall and make the Kzintis pay for their insolence.

I know that lots of other conditions would affect the Coalition player's decision, but what would you do in general and why?

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Friday, September 11, 2009 - 03:53 pm: Edit

Peter,

For me, much would depend on both defending forces available and forces in the theatre capable of putting on a nasty counter-attack on the following turn. It would also depend on the Zin's economic position - can he repair all those crippled carriers during CEDS retro or on the following turn.
If I could mount a good counter attack after taking the damage on the defenders, I would let the damage fall (unless he could CEDS repair a goodly fraction of the crippled CV groups).

Otherwise, I would start killing his navy - particularly the CVs. That really helps in keeping the Zin contained. Also, killing fighters is always a high priority; those are fighters that won't absorb damage again for free. Consider that if it's turn 15 and you kill a CV with just 6 fighters you will have prevented something like 15*6 = 90 points of free damage being absorbed over the rest of the game. Probably well into the 100's since you can lose those fighters twice per turn.

It's one reason I'm excited to see CVs being easier to kill in the new rule set for F&E 2010.

By **Kosta Michalopoulos (Kosmic)** on Friday, September 11, 2009 - 07:51 pm: Edit

Context is everything. When is this happening? What is the strategic situation? As the Coalition player, it all depends on what I want to permit the Kzinti player to do in the future.

If it's early in the game, and this is just a reckless raid on his part from, say, the safety of the Marquis territory, I may very well focus on killing a CV group each round, even if this choice costs me the SB. His loss of 6 CV groups is a FAR bigger loss for him than the loss of the SB is for me. I would only target the DN's if: (a) I did not do enough damage to kill a CV group; (b) I had enough remaining maulers to target other juicy targets (the CVs) in later rounds; (c) it was the last remaining CR10 ship and he still had to fight several more rounds to kill the SB.

If this is "the last great battle" defending the last remaining Coalition hardpoint in Kzinti space later in the game, I may let the damage fall, hoping he impales himself on my SB and that the SB survives to fight another day, or at the very least does enough damage to prevent him from mounting another offensive for some time to come (if ever).

By **Lawrence Bergen (Lar)** on Saturday, September 12, 2009 - 09:16 am: Edit

Peter: If I, as the Coalition in your example, could kill 1 ship for 44 pts or 3 ships and 6 free damage absorption points per turn for just 10 points more, I think I am taking option B. Kosmic is correct though, context plays a major role. Do you want/need your SB? If you begin this tactic will it drive your opponent away faster than if you let damage fall? Is your opponent willing to lose that many carriers? 54 damage is a lot to absorb even for a carrier fleet. 18 fighters off the top then you begin to junk stuff.

Ted: You are hereby regulated to have to play "Alliance only" for 5 years following that statement.

By **Kevin Howard (Jarawara)** on Saturday, September 12, 2009 - 04:44 pm: Edit

Lawrence, remember, the 54 points kills ONLY the carrier - the escorts get away
perfectly alive.

Nevertheless your analysis is still valid. Killing the carrier means you don't face constant damage absorption over the course of the war, but getting a free round of no cripples can do wonders to the Kzintis chance to kill your starbase. Which is more important at the time will determine whether to direct or not.

I would on occasion chose the DN over the CV, as if he were short of command ships, but long on carriers, you can turn the tide of that battle and hurt him in the sector for awhile. But if you can't produce that effect, then killing a carrier is more useful in the long run.

As the war goes on, killing the carrier becomes less useful, but then again, killing the DN becomes less useful too (lots more command ships available).

By David Slatter (Davidas) On Sunday, September 13, 2009 - 05:09 pm: Edit

Peter

Critical question..

The Zin may be intending to destroy the SB, but can they?

1) If they are going to blow it up whatever the coalition do, directing on Zin DNs/CVs is usually the better option (direct to destroy, not cripple). Likewise, if the Zin are going to lose whatever, you should again direct (but if they are going to lose, why are they hanging around under a SB's guns).

2) If directing on the Zin navy makes it possible for the Zin to win the battle where previously they could not, generally speaking, you should not direct, as the SB is a valuable asset you won't want to lose unnecessarily.

By Peter Bonfanti (Otherbonfanti) On Sunday, September 13, 2009 - 08:10 pm: Edit

Thanks to all for the thoughtful answers.

Kevin, the 54 points will actually kill the whole CV group, not just the CV itself: (21 + 11) x 2 - 10 = 54.

Regarding the strategic situation, this scenario is largely theoretical. In my current game, I have an SB at 1105 that he'll presumably eventually attack. So, assuming that he has enough stuff that the SB will fall no matter what I do, I'm wondering what I will do. I really want to kill CVs, but letting that much damage fall is certainly tempting.

We'll see what happens when the day comes.

By Kevin Howard (Jarawara) On Monday, September 14, 2009 - 02:04 am: Edit

Oh, sorry - I was thinking of the various new systems being bantered about,
forgot to do the old fashioned math.

So that just reinforces Lawrence's point. Kill 3 ships instead of just one.

A request for strategy advice:

I'm playing Reptilicon Revenged, that 3-turn scenario between the Gorns and the Romulans, and I'm having trouble devising a strategy for stopping the Romulans. (More correctly, I *am* the Romulans, my new opponent is the Gorn, but my strategy as Gorn is to take advantage of Romulan blunders. If I'm the Romulan, and presumably not blundering, then how do I stop... Me? If I can't think of a way, how can I give advice to the new player?)

So the problem is this: The Gorns have a wide flank on the ISC border, and if the Romulans break out into this area, the place is wide open for looting. The goal is to destroy battlestations, and there are several here (5006, 5105, 4904, 5203) that are ripe for the picking. If the Gorns overdefend these locations, they aren't defending the starbases enough. If they underdefend, I pick several of them off. If they set small reserves, I put enough to overwhelm them (or cloak and maul). If they use large reserves, they aren't hitting me on their turn.

So how would you stop the Romulans from even getting into that area? Three of the four are accessible without having a forward base, coming right out of 4910. (Admittedly 5203 is difficult to reach.)

And as a secondary question, would it break the balance of the scenario to simply forbid that area to be attacked? (Attacking into the Fed border zone activates that fleet, but there's no ISC border fleet... then again, if there's no threat from the ISC, why are there even BATS built there?) I'm sure I could modify the scenario for our own game, but would it improve the scenario overall if those ISC border BATS were simply off-limits?

Thanks for any insight.

Kevin, if the Gorns have cheap field repairs that is one thing they need to use to the fullest extent possible.

They won't have to worry about field repairs at the end of the third turn.

Kevin,

Just play it out. If you're worried about the Romulans being too powerful, give them the "low" die roll for home fleet release.
I think you'll find that a couple of decent Gorn reserves (and there's no reason for two VERY good RESVs for the first turn) will make the Romulan's job harder.

Also, you can always play the game twice, switching sides after the first time.

But yes, the Gorn will lose some BATS. It's hardwired into the victory conditions that they will lose some. They probably shouldn't lose a SB though.

By MikeMascitti (Lokiwormtongue) On Wednesday, October 14, 2009 - 04:24 pm: Edit

I am unfamiliar with the set up but as the Gorn i would try to lure the Roms into the SBs. Leave a decent force on the SB enough to make it hurt the Roms but nothing to make the roms just say forget it. Make sure a Battle Tug is at the SB and if possible an FRD. Rapid Combat repair the Battle Tug for a whopping cost of 2 Points due to the Gorn discount. If you have an FRD there you can do this for four rounds since you are able to use the full 12 points of an FRD or PRD for rapid combat repair. This added ability to take extra damage should end up withstanding the Rom attack as well as take a good hunk of the Rom attack capacity for the next turn from them as they are stuck with a ton o cripples. If no FRD available this tactic is a lot riskier.

By Dave Fedoruk (Dfedoruk) On Saturday, October 24, 2009 - 02:22 pm: Edit

Hey all
Quick question, but does anyone have any rough ideas for what the heck the Lyrans should concentrate on doing?
Having a group start the whole General War, I'm running the Lyrans, but haven't played F&E in years (before the 2000 update) and haven't played Lyrans at all. (The Klingon player is also new, Fed and Kzin players are experienced) Should I be converting as many CA/CL's to DN's/BC's as possible? Bad idea?
If anyone has any general thoughts, or can point me to any resources, don't mind buying a CL or two (or 3 or 4) if there's some good suggestions in them.)

Anyway if you can offer any direction it'd be greatly appreciated.

By Dave Fedoruk (Dfedoruk) On Saturday, October 24, 2009 - 02:22 pm: Edit

Hey all
Quick question, but does anyone have any rough ideas for what the heck the Lyrans should concentrate on doing?
Having a group start the whole General War, I'm running the Lyrans, but haven't played F&E in years (before the 2000 update) and haven't played Lyrans at all. (The Klingon player is also new, Fed and Kzin players are experienced) Should I be converting as many CA/CL's to DN's/BC's as possible? Bad idea?
If anyone has any general thoughts, or can point me to any resources, don't mind buying a CL or two (or 3 or 4) if there's some good suggestions in them.)
Anyway if you can offer any direction it'd be greatly appreciated.

Well, this will be a nice training game....

Converting CA->DN, and CL->BC is Definitely worthwhile. Some people also build a 2nd SB at the Lyran capital to allow a 2nd major conversion starting on T4.

In general, your goals should basically be as follows: Hit all three BATS on T1 (0701, 0703, 0803) after pinning the Count's fleet at 0902. The Kzinti will use his other reserve to save one of the BATS. Don't proceed past approach at that battle, but do kill the other two BATS.

Make sure the Klingons move their T1 construction into a location from which they threaten the Kzinti capital. (Along with the Northern fleet setup.)

Then remain as forward deployed as possible (excepting the cripples of course.) Your RESVs should be able to cover anything the Kzinti are likely to do to you. It's not a bad idea to leave the RESVs at the RedClaw SB, along with the T1 cripples.

On T2, if you've provided enough of a threat to make the Kzinti worry about their capital, you should be able to concentrate on the Count's SB. When here, DON'T direct at anything. Just let the Kzinti apply the damage as he wants. You'll take the SB down soon enough.

That's a good start. Post your game in "reports from the front" and you'll get as much advice as you ask for....

I'd save your Lyran CA's for future maulers and use your major conversion for CL to BC conversions each turn. You get more command ships to help out the Klingons who never have enough of them.

Otherwise, it is a very good idea on conversions.

If you have the Planetary Operations expansion then crippled CLs converted to BCs are the way to go.

Thomas,

You're not thinking about conversion during repair, are you?

You know that CDR cannot change the base hull type, right?

Yes I was, and your right that can't be done. But you might as well repair then
convert a crippled CL to a BC. You just don't get the EP savings.

One way to save some money in the conversion is to put a CL a turn into the Depot Level Repair (if using). It gets repaired for free and if you put a Major Conversion Yard off map it's right there for conversion to a BC.

I never considered that. Ryan, I suggest you make a Tac Note of that if it hasn't been done. It could also apply to Kzini BCs becoming CVSs.

Convert every single CA/CC you have into DN's. Build as many maulers as possible afterwards. Once you run out of starting CA's you should have enough and can skimp to max your maulers. Build the extra SB to get more DN's fast (or perhaps forget that and build more carriers). With all those DN's, build line after line of 5-6 DN's plus BG or other damage soaks. The alliance cannot match the resulting 120 point lines (132 with drone bombardment - get some D6D's from the Klingons)(Assuming Admirals, sorry).

While this is somewhat expensive, it definitely pays out, especially if your Coalition is trying to take out the Kzin/Hydran/Gorn capitals and win that way.

If it does not look like your Coalition is going for the three capital gambit, I would personally skip the extra starbase, and spend the money maxing out your carriers. It will take longer to assemble the same number of big lines, but the extra carriers will help a lot more late game.

If using AO, build 'enough' DN's as DNL's, to ensure you can also have those big lines have 4 DN, DNL, Mauler auto success pursuit lines too.

I'd aim to take and keep the Kzinti capital by turn 5, then the Hydran before turn 10. Push the Hydrans off map if at all possible - once off, they aren't getting back on until well into the endgame. Use your carriers to counter the Kzinti/Hydran ones, especially where your big lines won't be able to meet their counterattacks.

Thanks all! I'll try and post the game in the "reports on the front" section once we start.

Probably be begging for advice there as well ;)

I would suggest for conversions that you convert CL>BC at every opportunity. CA>DN is not nearly as good a conversion.

Also consider the CA>CC conversion for the Lyrans. Its a 1ep conversion that
changes an 8 compot unit into a 9. This works wonders for the Lyrans. Without a
derth of CV's to take damage on, they need efficient hulls to repair. By putting 9
point CC's on the line they get a very good Compot unit and in addition a VERY
efficient ship to repair. You can resolve 9 damage for 2 EP repair costs. This is .
222 EP per damage point the lauded CW damage sponge is only slightly better
at .214 EP per damage point.

Don't go wild with the CA>CC but do go wild the CL>BC for sure since that takes
a relatively worthless ship and converts it to something VERY worthwhile
(Although the CL does convert to their early HDW Hybrid iirc). You will want to
save CA's for STT, and even though the CA+1EP>CC is a great conversion, the
Lyrans are not made out of money! And they will want to make sure and send as
much EP as they can manage to the Klingons! Oh stop cringing! The Klingons
have CV's and better specialty ships, also the most important aspect, EP's
invested in Klingon ships can eventually face the Feds, Lyrans Ep's spent on ships
cannot do so nearly as easily. This fact alone makes Klingon EP's better than
Lyran. So don't be stingy.

The CA>DN is an alluring temptation that is best left untouched. Your CA's do a
much better job becoming CC's and STT's. Your BC is an equivalent command hull
to the DN which is what you need anyway. You will NOT be purposefully resolving
damage onto DN's but you will be onto CC's quite often actually. When you
consider that you can take CL and make it a BC to lead your ships and then also
convert CA>CC the choice to me is obvious.

By all means create a second SB for the extra Major conversion. You will be glad
you did. If your using Planetary Ops build the Major conversion facility as soon as
possible.

The Lyrans can be a fun race to play, you need to recognize your weaknesses and
play to your strengths. Your major flaw is the lack of CV's to begin the game. Your
strength is widely available CR10 hulls and alot of hulls that can become damage
absorbers.

One other thing to consider, do NOT underestimate the ability of the Hydrans to
strike your southernmost SB. By all means prosecute the Kzinti, help the
Klingons, don't forget to defend your southern reaches or you will regret it
against a competent Hydran player.

As a long time Lyran fan, I second Mike Parker.

I only convert CA to DN if I otherwise can't do CL to BC, and that ain't often
'cause I try hard to have CLs available to convert.

One other thing to consider. If, for some reason, you can't convert a CL to BC for
want of a CL hull, then instead consider using your major conversion for the turn to build a DND for 4 eps. This beauty of a ship can then be used to convert a CA to a DN for 3 EPs, at a normal starbase! Costs you both the CA and the DND to do it, but no one else in the game can build an "instant" DN at a regular starbase.

When you do get to build Lyran CVs, build them at the maximum allowed rate. Lyran CV groups are outstanding because the escorts don't suffer compot degradation like many other races' escorts.

Oh, something else - taking damage on the BC's *can* be efficient, if you're smart about it. Control BC damage to one or two a turn. Then, make sure you get them offmap to the Lyran depot. You can drop 1 BC per turn into the Depot. That's 2.5 EPs you won't have to spend in repairs. Over the course of the game you can save a good 80 EPs in repairs!

If using advanced EW, another good Lyran conversion is the FF to DWS. Turns the curse of a 4-point frigate into a very good early EW platform in a conversion that can be done at any starbase.

Michael Parker wrote: The CA>DN is an alluring temptation that is best left untouched.

This puzzles me. Why? Especially if you are spending the money on a second major conversion anyways, maximal CA>DN conversions gives the Coalition battle lines that obliterate anything the Alliance can field against them until very late game, for no extra economic cost. The damage boost you get from very high compots is magnified by the fighters - against 18 fighters on the line, a 132 compot fleet (6 DN, Mauler, BG, 12pt DB) will deal ~50% extra real damage each round over a 108 (DN,Mauler,5 CC, BG) point line (132*.25-18=15 vs 108*.25-18=9, 132*.3-18=22 vs 108*.3-18=14). Massive compot blows through anything but the heaviest fighter lines and deals damage levels the Alliance cannot sustain. On top of that, on a good roll you can blow away some unstuffed carrier groups, forcing the Alliance to stuff them (losing compot or EW platforms). Last game the Feds lost a 3CVB that way.

I am quite interested in why the CA>DN conversion to field multiple 'super' fleets is not a good idea, or more accurately how the Alliance takes advantage of a Coalition doing so. Because so far for me, this method has won the Coalition nearly all its games.

Tim.

The argument is that you are taking an already good ship, a CA and making a DN.
But if you do the CL to BC conversion you take a pretty worthless CL hull and make it into a very good BC hull. Also doing this saves your CAs for all of the other big conversions they are good for (STT, CVD, CV). This is especially important since they only build one CA per turn, they will run out of CA hulls pretty quickly with all of the demand, but you will almost never run out of CLs since they can be subbed for a CW.

It's not to say the extra DNs aren't good, just that converting the CLs gives the Lyrans more "good" ships, and remember the BC will make a very good if expendable PFT later in the war (yes the DN does too, but it stings a bit less to loose a BC to DD).

What Mr. Padilla said and I will further state.

The CA is a wonderful ship that can become

STT - Which is very nice
CV/CVD's - Lyran CV's are rare but very nice to have with their really efficient escorts
CC - I cannot stress enough how important efficient damage absorption is. And the Lyrans never have enough CW's with CA-CC being 1 point and making a lackluster damage absorber (8/4) into a very good (9/5) hull you can field them in droves and be very high compot with 9 str units and absorb damage well. Tug's and SR's - which you need both of

In addition your CL is not a very effective ship for you. It will almost never see the line as its inefficient to repair and lower compot than your CW which is your SZ3 BG member. However it is Wonderful as a BC.

Consider, when you convert a CA+6ep->DN you take a CR9 ship and make it CR10 and gain 4 compot. This CA can even occasionally make it onto a line as a good compot ship. AND it has such a good future as a Mauler, Carrier, Tug/Survey or Command Cruiser.

OR you can take a CL+6ep->BC you take a CR6 ship and make it CR10 you gain 4 compot and you take a ship that has almost no other use be it conversion or line duty and put it to very good use.

CL's either become BC's or they are for the most part pin count hulls not much more valuable than an FF. However they can grow up to be a ship that is the mainstay of your Navy. With a conversion every turn and a build every year your getting 3 a year, and you still can build a mauler from your excess CA's and Tugs sub'd for your CA hull.

If I couldn't take the relatively bad CL and make it a very important BC I would
be all over CA->DN like a duck on a junebug... its a very good conversion too.
but since you can do EITHER CL->BC or CA->DN I will honestly do CL->BC
everytime.

If I am out of CL hulls and having to sub out a CW to build one at 6ep and
additionally I am no longer building STT's or Tugs.. I would probably consider CA-
>DN at that point.. but not before then.

In a one year cycle you Build one DN and one BC. You can then either convert
CA->Dn twice or CL->BC twice. So in essence you can end up with

3xDN BC -or- DN 3xBC for the same cost. Only 4 TOTAL COMPOT more in a year.
For that 4 compot deficient however I have in essence converted 2xCL->2xCA

So its more proper to ask yourself this. All other things being equal would you
prefer the following

F: DN BC
S: 2xDN
-or-
F: 2xBC CL->CA
S: DN BC CL->CA

---

By Michael Parker (Protagoras07) ON Friday, November 13, 2009 - 06:34 pm: Edit

---

Quote:

against 18 fighters on the line, a 132 compot fleet (6 DN, Mauler, BG,
12pt DB) will deal ~50% extra real damage each round over a 108
(DN,Mauler,5 CC, BG) point line

---

I will stipulate to that. However I am not going to be putting up a 108 point line.
With my conversion plan I will have a force like

DN, 5xBC, Mauler, [3xD5 F5Q] 3xD6D(DB) = 122 so only 10 compot less so that
is 3 less damage per round. Which isn't inconsiderable I admit but for that
reduction I have 5xCA somewhere instead of 5xCL. For 5 more EP I have 5xCC
which do things like get in a BF like

BC 4xCC STT [3xCW 3xDW] DWS (scout) and make VERY resilient all Lyran
battleforces.

---

By Kevin Howard (Jarawara) ON Friday, November 13, 2009 - 11:53 pm: Edit
If the Alliance wants to keep you honest, they'll be frying your DN for 36 points as often as they can. You'll end up with an uber fleet for awhile, then you'll be low on DN's again, low on CA's, and be relying on a few BC's and lots of CL's.

However, the BC is less tempting a target, and since all those CA/CC's are still around, they have sufficient backup. The alliance will see this, and probably not bother to direct. Net result, your fleet of good ships grows instead of shrinks.

Also, if you chose to protect your extra DN's by keeping them for only the most important battles, then you've spent a bunch of money to have DN's sitting in the background gathering space-dust. Convert those CL's to BC's, and you can afford to put them in every battle that comes along. You're more likely to get constant use of your investment.

It might be nice to do *a few* extra DN's, for those really important times, but for everyday use I'm going to stick to the BC's.

The Lyran BC! Powerful, yet expendable! (Don't tell the crews that, they'll mewl pitifully.)

I can see that running a more efficient CL>BC plus some other valuable conversions may be better in some cases, especially when you need a more robust fleet overall, rather than some top notch stuff and pin count ships. I suppose part of my problem is that it has never really been that needy for such a depth of fleet quality. Usually the Lyrans are mostly keeping the boot on the Kzinti and Hydran necks, via 90% of the Lyran/Klingon carriers and 5 or 6 of the Klingon/Lyran reserve counters. (I push the Hydrans off map, so as to not need reserves on their front). That doesn't leave much capability for the Kzinti to wreak havoc on the fringes - the best ships are going to reserve out to meet them, along with enough fodder. Normally.

Another advantage with the oodles of DN's is the pursuit lines - 4DN,DNL Mauler gets 6-8 extra compot, which may net you a crippled carrier in pursuit. Again, not a huge difference, but perhaps enough.

I do have some plans for next game to try to force that better depth of quality, but will have to see how it works out. As you say, the 10 points of compot difference may not be that big a deal especially if the coalition does sometimes have to fight elsewhere with weak fleets.

Kevin - as for the Alliance directing on the DN's, while it was considered each time, it was always rejected as a waste. Every time they pop a DN, they are almost halving that rounds damage. Also, most of the time the Alliance is unlikely to get the 36 points needed. When they can, over SB or other good defenses,
does the Alliance want to kill 3CW or 1 DN? Especially when they know the Lyrans are churning out 5 replacements a year, and there are enough replacements waiting in case you do pop a couple of DN's that battle. The Lyrans usually end the game with 35-40 DN's, after losing 3-5 and slacking off on building them later. And I do always field the 6 DN lines wherever they are, barring perhaps the first couple of rounds of a capital assault.

Finally, I think the acid test is to actually get a game not be a three alliance capital victory, so that the long term weakness of the DN only strategy comes into play. Gotta figure out the Alliance better.

Tim.

I've always found that the Lyrans tend to have more money than their production schedule can suck up, as well as being slightly 'heavy' in their fleets (lacking large numbers of attrition hulls).

In the game I am currently playing, I have embarked on the construction of minor shipyards and conversion facilities. When complete, this will allow me to put an extra 2 CWs in production at normal cost (5 EP each), and 4 DWs (2 built, 2 FF converted at the minor facilities for \(2.5 + 3 \times 2 + 4 \times 2 = 19\)), while giving me 1 unused large conversion that can be spent on CL --> BC conversion.

29 EP for 6 attrition hulls and a total ComPot of 38/20. I'd say that's not a bad tradeoff, especially when compared to 3 overbuilt CWs which cost 30 EP and only give you 21/12 ComPot.

Mike, don't forget to build your 2 FF Minor Shipyards as well. It will give you a couple of more attrition hulls that can be built/converted other more useful hulls.

And you can build a major conversion facility somewhere as well. Great for that CL to BC. Without cutting into mauler production.

Best spot for the Lyran MaCF is off map to catch ships coming out of the depot.

*chuckles* I was wondering... What ship is the MaCF never heard of it.. Major Conversion Facility 😊

Hey unless for some reason your going through DW's like crazy.. don't convert FF's to DW's. The DW is useful to be put as SZ4 BG groups since they can use the DWL leader rule.. but 6/3 is not efficient for taking damage. There are some good Lyran DW conversions.. but unless you are short of the hull just keep them FF's as FF's and use the extra ep's elsewhere.. like gifts to the klingons
FF to DWS is always very useful, and can be quite vexing to the Kzin when you field an EW heavy battlebroup.

Yup.